

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

JEFFREY B. JENNINGS  
Chairman  
SAMUEL K. SHAW  
Vice-Chairman  
J.C. ROUNDTREE  
MELVIN JERALDS  
CLAYTON D. RIGGS



RANDELL K. WOODRUFF  
County Manager

AVA MURGIA  
Clerk of the Board/  
Assistant to the Manager

**Camden County Board of Adjustment  
Record of Proceedings**

August 5, 2002, 7:00 PM  
Senior Center Conference Room  
Courthouse Complex

Chairman Roger Lambertson called to order a meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment with the following members present: Roger Lambertson, Morris Kight, Clayton Riggs, William McPherson, Robert Johnson and Emory Upton. Also present were Dave Parks, Permit Technician and Melissa Gray, Clerk to the Board. The following member was absent: Willie Gallop

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the agenda. Chairman Lambertson stated that items #5, 7, and 8 would be removed from the agenda.

Chairman Lambertson called for consideration of the July 1, 2002 minutes. Kight made a motion to approve the minutes as read. Lambertson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Chairman Lambertson called for comments from the public. Hearing none Chairman Lambertson continued with the agenda.

---

**Old Business**

**Item # 1 Appeal (UDO 2002-05-46) from David Peal on Ralph Sawyer dirt bike track (CEA 2002-04-01) located at 218 Bunker Hill Road, South Mills Township – attachments**

David Peal, 115 Pudding Ridge Road, applicant was sworn in with Attorney Keith Teague representing Mr. Peal. Mr. Teague started off by asking Mr. Peal questions about his land and home. Mr. Peal stated that at the time he purchased his land and built his home there were not any dirt bike racing. Mr. Teague then asked Mr. Peal about Exhibit A which was a picture of Mr. Peal's house after construction. Mr. Peal stated the picture was of his home after construction and it does not show a dirt bike track. Exhibit B is a picture which shows the existing tract. Mr. Peal stated that dust and dirt blow onto his property and he also has a problem with noise. Mr. Peal stated that he tried talking with the property owner Mr. Sawyer and told him about the problems he was having. Mr. Peal then presented a video as Exhibit C which showed 2 persons riding on the dirt bike track. Mr. Peal stated that in the last month there has not been much activity for riding.

Gary Sawyer was sworn in and submitted a tax map and pictures to the board. Mr.

Sawyer stated a picture submitted to the board shows a dirt bike jumping and Mr. Peal's house is in the background under construction. Mr. Sawyer tried to comply with Mr. Peal's wishes and not bother him.

Eddie Hyman, 113 Sunset Ave was sworn in and stated he was representing the Sawyer's and said that in 1997 there was an informal race track on the Sawyer's property.

Chairman Lambertson stated that the board would rule on if there was an existing track prior to 1998 and if so, had there been major modifications done to it. Chairman Lambertson stated that according to the evidence there was a track in existence prior to 1998.

Mr. Teague then stated his closing arguments that the track was a hardship on Mr. Peal and his home.

Chairman Lambertson made a motion to deny the appeal. McPherson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0, with Johnson – yes, Kight – yes, Lambertson – yes, McPherson – yes, and Upton – yes.

Chairman Lambertson called for a short recess.

Chairman Lambertson called the meeting back to order.

---

**Item #2 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-05-22) from John Aldridge and Melachi L. Wilson to conduct a flea market business located at 396 Camden Causeway, Courthouse Township – attachments**

John Aldridge, applicant was sworn in at stated that the NC Department of Transportation and the Corp of Engineers had been out to the property.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff who stated they had looked into NCDOT and the Corp of Engineers and recommended approval with conditions stated in the finding of facts.

Chairman Lambertson stated he would like to see conditions that there would be signs for designated parking areas and parking spaces be installed. Also require an entrance and an exit for parking with signs stating the direction of traffic flow. Also require an adequate number of parking spaces per person. The flea market cannot open for business until such time that all conditions are met.

Hearing no comments from the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the Findings of Fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
    - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
    - **Upton seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
    - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?

- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-05-22:
- **Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**New Business**

Item #1 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-07-16) from Sprint Telephone to install pair green equipment in a metal cabinet to extend the capacity of existing cable along Culpepper Road to meet forecasted growth located at 110 Culpepper Road, South Mills Township – attachments

Stan Stone, of Rocky Mount represented Sprint Telephone and stated Sprint requested an application for placement of cable line equipment on property 110 Culpepper Road for growth. Mr. Stone stated that the equipment did not make any noise and the equipment would be 4'x 6' instead of 3'x 3'.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff which recommended approval with the conditions stated in the findings of fact.

Hearing no comments from the public Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
- A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
- B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?

- **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight,**

## **McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
  - **Lambertson made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-07-16:
  - **McPherson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #2 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-06-17) from Vicki Forbes to install a new Class A doublewide located at 609 Sandy Hook Road, Shiloh Township – attachments**

Vicki Forbes, of 788 North 343 was sworn in and stated she was requesting a Conditional Use Permit to place a new doublewide at 609 Sandy Hook Road.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff who recommended approval with the conditions as stated in the findings of fact.

Hearing no comments from the public Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
    - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
    - **Upton seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
    - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
    - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**



- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-06-17:
- **Kight made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #3 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-06-36) from Kevin & Dolores Worden to install a used Class A doublewide located at 119 Stiles Road, South Mills Township – attachments**

Kevin Worden of Virginia Beach was sworn in and stated he wished to move his doublewide from Virginia Beach to 119 Stiles Road.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff, who stated staff recommends approval with conditions as stated in the findings of fact.

Chairman Lambertson called for comments from the public. Hearing none he continued with the findings of fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
- **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**

- **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
2. Is the application complete?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
    - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
    - **Johnson seconded the motion**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
    - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
    - A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
      - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
      - **Upton seconded the motion.**
      - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
    - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
      - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
      - **Kight seconded the motion.**
      - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
    - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
    - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
      - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
      - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
      - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **Kight made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-06-36:
- **Lambertson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
-

Item #4 Conditional Use Permit (UDO 2002-07-08) from James A. Whitehurst, Jr. to install a new Class A doublewide located at 269 McPherson Road, South Mills Township – attachments

James A. Whitehurst, Jr., of 179 McPherson Road was sworn in and stated he was requesting a permit to place a new doublewide at 269 McPherson Road, South Mills.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff, who stated staff recommends approval with conditions as stated in the findings of fact.

Hearing no comments from the public Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
- A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
- B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
  - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**

- **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
  - **Kight made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-07-08:
  - **Upton made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #5 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-07-10) from William A. Stevens to install a new Class A doublewide located at 116 Highway 158 West, Courthouse Township – attachments**

Chairman Lambertson stated item #5 was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the board receiving their packet.

---

**Item #6 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-07-20) from Harry and Betty Smith to install a new Class A doublewide located at 1029 North Highway 343, South Mills Township – attachments**

Betty Smith of Chesapeake, VA was sworn in and stated she and her husband wished to place a new doublewide on the lot at the corner of Beechnut Ave and North 343.

Chairman Lambertson called upon staff who recommended approval with the conditions as stated in the findings of fact.

Hearing no comments from the public, Chairman Lambertson continued with the findings of fact.

1. Is the requested permit within its jurisdiction, according to the table of uses?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that it is within jurisdiction.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
2. Is the application complete?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the application is complete.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

3. Is the application a Nonconforming Use?
  - **Lambertson made a motion the application is not a nonconforming use.**
  - **McPherson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
4. Will the proposed use comply with all of the requirements of this ordinance?
  - **McPherson made a motion that the proposal will comply with all requirements.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Will the use applied for meet all the requirements of the zoning district where it is proposed to be located?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the use will meet all requirements of the zoning district.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Will the proposed use meet all of the special requirements (if any) for that particular type of use?
    - **McPherson made a motion that it will.**
    - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
5. If the proposed use meets all requirements of the ordinance, is it appropriate for the area where it is intended to be located?
  - **Lambertson made a motion that the use is appropriate for the area.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  - A. Does the evidence show that it will not endanger the public health or safety?
    - **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not endanger the public health or safety.**
    - **Kight seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
  
  - B. Does the evidence show that it will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property?
    - **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**
    - **Johnson seconded the motion.**
    - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

- C. Does the evidence show that it will be in harmony with the particular neighborhood or area where it is proposed to go?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in harmony with the area.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- D. Does the evidence show that it will be in general conformity with the County's adopted land use plan?
- **Lambertson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will be in conformity with the county's land use plan.**
  - **Upton seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
- E. Does the evidence show that it will not exceed the County's ability to provide adequate public facilities, such as schools, fire protection, law enforcement coverage, water supply, sewage or drainage facilities?
- **McPherson made a motion that the evidence shows that it will not exceed the county's ability to provide adequate fire, water and rescue.**
  - **Lambertson seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
6. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for approval or disapproval of the findings of facts:
- **Upton made a motion to approve the Finding of Facts as submitted by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**
7. Chairman Lambertson called for consideration for granting or denying the Conditional Use Permit for UDO 2002-07-20:
- **McPherson made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with conditions as recommended by staff.**
  - **Kight seconded the motion.**
  - **The motion passed 5-0 with Lambertson, Upton, Kight, McPherson and Johnson voting aye.**

---

**Item #7 Variance Application (UDO 2002-07-29) from James Hewitt to install a Class B singlewide mobile home in a Highway Commercial Zone located at 1342 North Highway 343, South Mills Township – attachments**

Chairman Lambertson stated that item #7 was withdrawn from the agenda.

---



**Item #8 Conditional Use Permit Application (UDO 2002-07-27) from James Hewitt to install a Class B singlewide located at 1342 North Highway 343, South Mills Township – attachments**

Chairman Lambertson stated that item #8 was withdrawn from the agenda.

---

**Items from board members and staff**

Chairman Lambertson referenced the memo to the board members contained in the packet. The members were asked to please contact Melissa Gray, Clerk to the Board if they were not able to attend the scheduled meeting for the month.

---

**Information**

Board of Commissioners Minutes – May 6, 2002 & May 20, 2002  
Planning Board Minutes – June 24, 2002

---

**Consideration for date of next meeting – September 9, 2002**

The next meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment will be held on Monday, September 9, 2002.

---

**Adjournment**

Upton made a motion that the meeting of the Camden County Board of Adjustment be adjourned. Lambertson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

---

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Melissa Gray, Clerk to the Board